DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 139 IR 052 641

AUTHOR Moul, Richard H.
TITLE Discourses of Vision and Necessity: The Information Age, the Library, and the Language of Leadership.
PUB DATE 10 Jul 88
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Library Administration and Management Association President's Program at the Annual Convention of the American Library Association (New Orleans, LA, July 10, 1988).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication (Thought Transfer); Cultural Influences; *Discourse Analysis; Information Dissemination; *Leadership; *Library Administration; *Library Planning; Library Role; *Library Science; Scientific and Technical Information; Social Structure; *Technological Advancement; User Needs (Information)
IDENTIFIERS University of Maryland College Park

ABSTRACT

Focusing on the point of contrast between the library, whose primary role is the preservation of knowledge, and other dimensions of an information society where knowledge has become increasingly fragmented and exteriorized, this paper begins by defining leadership and reviewing various meanings assigned to the term "discourse." Several topics are then discussed, including the fundamental importance of the individual's contribution to the creation of a discourse through which a community is constituted; the rules by which these actions are authorized and judged; and the relationship between speech (or communication) and power. These notions are used to emphasize some key aspects of the leadership role in librarianship. An examination of the outer world (society at large) leads to a discussion of two dimensions of information and knowledge in society, i.e., the external dimension of the information age, and internal dimension, or inner realm, of librarianship. In conclusion it is suggested that libraries bear the critical burden of preserving knowledge, facilitating access to it, and participating in the discourse of the information society. (60 notes) (CGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304139

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

DISCOURSES OF VISION AND NECESSITY:

THE INFORMATION AGE, THE LIBRARY, AND THE LANGUAGE OF LEADERSHIP

Richard H. Moul

Contract Librarian, McKeldin Library, University of Maryland, College Park

Sunday Program Librarian, Fairfax County Public Libraries, Fairfax, Virginia

July 10, 1988

IR052641

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard H.Moul

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Introduction

This paper will focus on the point of contact between the library and other dimensions of an information society where knowledge has become increasingly fragmented and exteriorized. It will discuss the professional discourse of librarianship, examining its relevance to the current situation, and its capacity as a "language of leadership". Those who occupy leadership roles, formal or informal, shape the dialog within an organization (or profession) in such a way that it mobilized the community to meet challenges and opportunities imposed by the external environment. Unless members of a community "speak the same language," there is little possibility for effective action.

John Gardner's definition of leadership as "an interaction that involves a two-way flow of communication and influence" properly focuses on the role of communication in achieving a community's goals. Douglas MacGregor identified at least four major components of leadership, each of which involves communication in some way or another. These are: the leader's characteristics, the follower's characteristics, the organization's nature, and the external environment's social, economic, political and cultural facets. These components, in MacGregor's words mean that "leadership is not a property of the individual, but a complex relationship."[1]

Thus, leadership involves articulating cultural values and establishing the purposes for which a group engages in action. It involves articulating visions and translating them into action. A leader is responsible for the establishment of the boundaries within which activities will be carried out, and the criteria by which the group can measure its accomplishments. She or he is charged with leading the dialog establishing

what Thomas Kuhn has called a "disciplinary matrix," a network of communication and meaning formation binding together a subculture of specialists in a particular field with shared values and representations. This formation of a canon of professional values and behavior is one of leadership's key tasks.

Common discourse may be seen as the crucial element in the interface between all of the variables in the leadership relationship. The increasing centrality of information and knowledge, as well as revolutionary changes in the mechanisms for their transmission, requires librarians to understand the relationships between the various aspects of our profession and its external environment. Further, it requires us to reaffirm a forceful statement of our professional role in the cultural, political and social realms. I believe this reaffirmation to be vital for two reasons. First, librarianship is a well-placed profession to influence the positive development of the information society. Second, without a sufficient understanding of our role in supporting a responsible, reasonable and pluralistic democratic vision, we will lose our distinctiveness as a unique body of information/knowledge workers. We will be losing our voice to systems analysts, computer specialists, M.B.A.s, information entrepreneurs, and other worthy information workers who frequently have narrower views of their responsibilities in society. Such a scenario is worrisome both in terms of our profession's development and for the nature of the world we live in. If libraries are to retain their synergistic (and beneficial) relationship with the realms of knowledge, our leaders will need to continue to foster paradigms which accurately represent current political, economic, social and cultural situations, as well as appropriate strategic and tactical plans of action.

MacGregor's leadership relationship underscores the "artificial" nature of an organization. Herbert Simon has defined an artifact "as a meeting point ... between an 'inner' environment, the substance and organization of the artifact itself, and an 'outer' environment, the surroundings in which it operates." An organization, then, can be seen as an artifact, or a system, constructed through the interactions of its members as they go about defining an inner environment. Their success is determined by the system's ability to achieve goals established by the organization as it projects these values into the outer world. In systems thought, the success of an "artifact" such as the library is held to be a function of its ability to structure the inner resources at its disposal in order to adapt to changing circumstances. We have at hand the element of a model of the interaction between the library and society.[2]

As Michael Buckland has pointed out, libraries are "open systems." This is simply a way of saying that they are affected, and in turn affect, the world outside their doors.[3] What are the elements of this open system? We could say that the values and practices of librarianship constitute the system's inner realm. Using these resources, we configure our responses to changes in society. The state of knowledge and the role of information in society make up the library's outer environment, which is largely responsible for determining the demands made upon libraries by users. The leadership relationship in our profession is a discourse about the design and implementation of an artifact which accommodates the library's operation to the necessities imposed by developments in society.

I would like to make two general observations before we examine this point of contact between the inner realm of librarianship and the discourses

of societal knowledge. First, I would offer a caveat concerning my use of the language of systems theory. Systems thought tends to look at an interface in terms of how well the internal nature of the artifact is able to adapt, or conform, to dictates imposed by the external world. In other words, systems thinkers look primarily at the artifact in terms of its performance.[4] Obviously, the library's "performance" is a key component of what we want to explore when we concern ourselves with librarianship. Indeed many argue cogently that a lack of emphasis on performance is one of the weaknesses of our professional discourse. We indeed have a difficult time establishing criteria for judging how well our services contribute to the needs generated out in the external world.[5] That said, it should be noted that there is a snare that the systems approach may trap us in. Performance is an outlook which imposes some hidden assumptions on the analyst. Most important, is the acceptance of a way of judging that emphasizes the role knowledge plays in the process of production to the exclusion of its role as a component in processes of communication through which communities constitute themselves. Perhaps I have jumped ahead of myself here. The point is, if we are not careful, the performative dimension of the systems approach will lead us to accept a particular set of values from the external world without examining the internal values of our profession in order to validate these criteria as our primary goals.[6]

As professionals we have a responsibility to society to project our beliefs about the nature of knowledge, information and communication in community life into discussions of questions concerning these elements outside our doors. Such discussions require some hard thought about our inner and outer environments. We can best do this thinking, I believe, if we take up a position between these worlds of the library and talk about the way they interact.

What we are discussing here are the necessities that librarianship concerns itself with. What are we responsible for? Lester Asheim has pointed out, what binds practitioners from many different types of organizations who perform a multiplicity of tasks is the combination of a body of knowledge and skills with a sense of mission which is generated from a philosophy or ethic underlying a particular type of service. The professional mission is revealed, as Jose y Ortega Gassset pointed out over fifty years ago, "not with the man [sic] who practices the profession, his tastes, peculiarities, and suitabilities, nor with an abstract ideal which presumes to define once and for always what a library is, but with the social necessity which your profession serves."[7]

Where Ortega y Gasset saw the articulation of this necessity as a question of particular historical situations, or "facticity", the systems analyst views this as a question of appropriateness of design, given the environment.[8] The difference between these perspectives may seem pretty slight at first. Both emphasize the role of the external realm in establishing the agenda for the internal dimension of the system. Ortega y Gasset argues that the duty of the "librarian has varied in direct proportion to the significance of the book as a social necessity." Since he identifies the librarian's mission with a facet of the external environment (the use to which the patron puts the book -- or package) Ortega y Gasset's statement sounds remarkably similar to systems thinker Herbert Simon discussing goals as linkages between the inner and outer environments of a system: "to predict how it will behave, we need only ask, 'how would a rationally designed system behave under these circumstances?' The behavior takes on the shape of the task environment." Yet there is, I believe, a profound gulf between these

positions. They do not judge the same object. Simon is concerned with a task which is performed employing an algorithmic procedure judged by a concrete measure of performance. Ortega y Gasset is speaking of a mission which is created through the discourse of a community assessing its historical situation. While the question of performance at the level of the task environment is obviously of critical importance to the effectiveness of library service, it is not the appropriate criteria to use in defining the mission of the library. Such an approach enframes the concept of the library's mission in a performative economic paradigm which undercuts the library's responsibilities in political and cultural contexts. The discourse of librarianship must begin with an account of the fullest relationship between the institution and society.

My second preliminary observation involves answering the question, in what sense am I using the term discourse? A dictionary will tell us that we are dealing with a "verbal interchange of ideas; especially conversation." Right at the outset we are involved communication. Another usage goes a little bit deeper into what I am concerned with: "formal and orderly and usually extended expression of thought on a subject." Further, discourse is "connected speech or writing." Thus, the concept incorporates the notion of a formal interactive communicative process.[9] Discourse can be seen as conversation, or discussion, which is formulated according to some sort of standards or rules. These rules involve the form and context of messages, or "speech acts", introduced into the conversation, as well as the criteria used for examining and judging these new entries into the discussion, and the accreditation of participants.[10]

Discourse has become an axial, or organizing, principle in the work of a number of social observers. Theorists such as Michel Foucault, Francois Lyotard, and Jurgen Habermas, to name a few, have focused on it as a central feature in the creation of community life. A major concern of these writers is the relationship between knowledge and power in society. Consequently they focus on the role of discourses in providing access to power and in legitimating its role within a group. As Lyotard points out, "the social bond is linguistic."[11]. These observers have undertaken detailed analyses of the role of language, communication, information and knowledge in community life. Discourse is both the object and the method of their efforts.

John E. Toews, an intellectual historian, has posited two variants of a theory of discourse. One centers around the use of language in establishing the structural relationships between theory, practice and judgment to constitute the relatively restrictive patterns of communication in disciplines. This approach, based largely on the work of Foucault, develops a theory of "the discourse of language" generated in his study of disciplines. Foucault develops a theory of social rules whereby "the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed according to a certain number of procedures whose role is to avert its powers and dangers, to cope with chance events, to evade its ponderous, awesome materiality." From Foucault's point of view, the key object in the analysis is the power structure which restricts discourse in various settings.[12] In his focus on disciplines, Foucault begins his study with a similar set of questions to those asked by Thomas Kuhn, who revolutionized the way science is conceived by showing that scientific

fields and disciplines operate under sets of assumptions and beliefs which he calls paradigms. Paradigms are uncontested as long as they adequately explain the results of research. They lose their power to hold practitioners together when they fail to account for anomalies that an accepted theory cannot explain. The process through which paradigms are created and discarded is discursive.[13]

The second concept of discourse developed by Toews grows out of public realm, primarily in the area of political discussion. Toews cites the work by a number of historians and thinkers concerned with "competing ethical and political ideologies articulated in the general space of 'public' culture." From this perspective competing discourses interact with each other, constantly changing as individuals refine them. Citing the work of Keith Baker and J.G.A. Pocock, Toews isolates three elements of a public discourse: 1) structural "paradigmatic languages" (Foucault's concept operates primarily on this level); 2) "Actions in Language," or the moves and counter-moves of participants: "it is this process of constant interaction between speech and language, action and structure, that constitutes a "discourse"; 3) The "historicity of language in discourse," involving the traditions of a particular discussion.[14]

The conception of discourse as the foundation of public life has been a major theme in the work of Jurgen Habermas, who has presented a detailed theory for analyzing the speech acts underlying discourse, as well as an analysis of the breakdown of the discourses underpinning the institutions of the modern age. For Habermas, free discourse is an essential component of an ideal society: The key task facing us is the establishment of structures for communication which provide all participants in social discourse with a "symmetrical distribution of chances to select and employ speech acts. ... Thus, the conditions for ideal discourse are connected to conditions for an ideal form of life..."[15]

Several themes run through the ideas discussed here. First, all are built upon the notion of the fundamental importance of "speech acts", or the individual's contribution to the creation of a discourse through which a community is constituted -- be the community a group of researchers, a profession, an organization, or a public institution. Second, all are concerned with the rules by which these actions are authorized, and by which they are judged. Finally they all concern the relationship between speech, or communication, and power. The ability to control or divert discourse confers power.

These notions can be used to focus our attention on some of the key aspects of the leadership relation in librarianship. Peering inward, the discourses which transpire in our professional circles and within our libraries will be seen to have much to do with our success in meeting our obligations. These conversations prepare the ground for action by building our corporate culture. Looking outward, we will find, I believe, that the necessities facing the library in an information society are closely related to the conservation of free discourse.

Hopefully, I have now clearly established the position from which I wish to examine the leadership relation in librarianship. We are standing at the juncture of our profession and its outer world, our society at large. We know that leadership involves articulating a meaning for our profession that goes deeper than an analysis of our performance at the level of the task-environment; it requires us to discuss the social necessities that give rise to our profession. Finally, we are cognizant that in order to lead we must either reconstruct or establish a discourse of librarianship which will inform our performance at the task environment level with the knowledge of our importance to society. The next step, then, is an examination of the outer world, which brings us to a discussion of information and knowledge in our society.

The External Dimension

It is by now commonplace to say we live in the information age. Somewhere around half of our workforce is engaged in information work of one sort or another. Furthermore, according to the OECD, by the 1970's, the information sector of the major western economies surpassed the agricultural, industrial and service sectors in each of these economies. In macroeconomic analysis, the bottom line is usually measured in terms of Gross National Product. Mark U. Porat's well-known calculations have shown that by 1967, close to half of U.S. GNP was generated through some sort of information-related activity.[16] Additionally, the phenomenal growth in the volume of information during the post-war era -- one estimate is that the rate of "increase has been so exponential that we have been able to generate more printed (emphasis added) information in the past ten years than in mankind's complete history" -- gives us an indication of its increasing importance.[17] Yet what do these data really mean? After all, as Norman D. Stevens recently pointed out, "information has long played, in one fashion or another, a key role in society." The problem, Stevens goes on to say, is that "we have not dealt adequately with the concept of information as a historical force."[18] In a sense Stevens points out the significance of the changes taking place today. We have now begun to recognize the centrality of information and knowledge. What signals the emergence of an information age is the development of discourses built around "information." To use an old phrase employed by the historian Carl L. Becker in his classic on the temper of eighteenth century thought, there is a "climate of opinion," a set of preconceptions, that informs current thought and is changing the

discourses by which we explain the world to ourselves.[19] Indeed, information has become a key metaphor in our approach to the world. Beyond their empirical significance, (in itself breathtaking) the data discussed above are evidences of this transition in our conversations.

Several developments provide the images for our discussions in the information age. The first of these is structural. The connection of telecommunications systems to computers has blurred the "distinction between processing and communications." Anthony Oettinger has called this compunications. Data, technology and organizational structures have been linked to create a revolutionary information infrastructure. Herbert Simon considers this linkage to have implications on a par with the development of writing and printing. He calls this the "third information revolution."[20] This information infrastructure is constructed around what J. David Bolter has termed the "defining technology" of the information age -- the computer. Much as the clock served as the metaphor for the mechanistic cosmology of Descartes and Copernicus, the computer is changing our outlook on the word: "...the computer is giving us a new definition of man, as an 'information processor', and of nature as 'information to be processed'." Bolter sees evidences of this change in the languages of the cognitive psychologist who "begins to study the mind's 'algorithm' for searching long term memory," the economist's input-output diagrams, the sociologist studying "quantitative history," or the "humanist who prepares a 'key-word-in-context' concordance."[21]

Daniel Bell believes that a distinctive problem of the information age is the management of "organized complexity." A characteristic of the post-industrial milieu is the need to manage large systems with many

variables. Many techniques for treating these questions have emerged since the last World War. Bell calls methods like those mentioned above "intellectual technologies." These "technologies", rooted primarily in probability theory, typically substitute "algorithms for intuitive judgments." Their goals involve "'ordering' the mass society."[22]

Underlying both the computer's power as a defining technology and the analytical and administrative power of intellectual technologies is the development of a fundamental paradigm for fields ranging from communications to linguistics to biology to physics. The information theory unveiled with the publication of Claude Shannon's two 1948 papers dealing with the transmission of messages has emerged as an essential feature of the discourse of the information society.[23] A consequence of these developments is the recognition of the status of information as a critical commodity. While having special properties, information becomes subject to market and political forces more directly than ever before. As Blaise Cronin has observed, "Information may be intangible, but the market now recognizes that information can, in some respects, be treated like any other commodity."[24] Thus far we have focused on computers and information as key components of the discourse affecting the library from the outside. As the library has traditionally concerned itself with the stock of public knowledge, a fair question to ask at this juncture is, what is the status of knowledge in the information society? Bell argues that one of the central features of the new social order is the centrality of theoretical knowledge:

> "...the advances in a field become increasingly dependent upon the primacy of theoretical work which codifies what is known and points the way to empirical confirmation. In effect, theoretical knowledge becomes the strategic resource, the axial principle of a society, and the university, research organizations, and intellectual institutions, where theoretical knowledge is codified and enriched, become the axial structures of the emergent society.[25]

For Bell, theoretical knowledge "consists of new judgments. It is "an organized set of statements...presenting a reasoned judgment or an experimental result." These are "transmitted...in some systematic form."[26] A key point here is the emphasis on communication and judgment. These are, as was pointed out earlier, the components of a discourse.

When we untie knowledge from its status as a "structure or an edifice"[27] and focus on the communicative aspects that go into producing, validating and judging it, at least three very interrelated issues emerge. The first of these involves legitimation. How do we judge statements made within a discourse? The second concerns the fragmentation of knowledge. How do the many diverse conversations interrelate? Finally, there is the pivotal question of how knowledge relates to power. Since we have seen that information has been transformed into a commodity it is worthwhile to ask, Is there a corollary involving knowledge? Indeed, as Bell points out, the organizations where "theoretical knowledge is codified and enriched become the axial structures" of the information society. Something must be afoot.

These questions are, or should be, of concern to librarians interested in leading their profession in the information age. One last point: These issues are unfolding in a time when the discourse concerning the nature of the public welfare in American society is also in turmoil. The terms defining our community life are undergoing intense scrutiny from many sides. As members of a profession tied overwhemingly to public organizations, librarians need to discuss these questions and library leaders will have to help shape the discourse.

At issue here is the nature of discourse in our society, as well as the question of access to discussions. The first is a matter of legitimacy, the second is a matter of power. The status of information and knowledge are axial components of these discussions.

As stated above, legitimacy involves judging and validating. It is a question of communication. According to Habermas, discourse involves the capacity to create a consensual "normative reality" where participants use agreed-upon criteria to judge the understandability, truth, sincerity and appropriateness of statements entered into a discussion. These "validity claims," as he calls them, are implied in most of the discourses we engage in. However, in discussions where paradigms are contested, where "the background consensus is fundamentally called into question," disputed claims can only be assessed "by entering into a discourse whose sole purpose is to judge the truth of the problematic opinion, or the correctness of a problematic norm."[28]

That there is a crisis of legitimacy -- a wide-scale rejection of one another's terms for discourse -- in the information society is widely noted.[29] Daniel Bell has developed this issue as a theory of "disjunction" between the social structure and cultural realms of post-industrial society. For Bell, society contains three realms, each operating under the terms of its own discourses: the social structure (which includes the economy, technology and the occupational system) is dominated by a discourse of economizing; the culture (the realm of expressive symbolism and meanings) is grounded in a discussion of self-fulfillment; finally, the polity (which regulates the distribution of power and the mediation of individual and group claims) is dominated by a discourse of participation.[30]

Many social theorists conceive of these features as components of a unitary system, where regulation and control ultimately seek to generate harmony. Bell agrees that in the past, these realms were held together by common values and character structure. This is no longer the case. Each

realm has developed its own language and poses questions and challenges for the others. They tend to propel discussion along increasingly antagonistic lines. Actors belonging primarily to one discourse or another frequently talk past each other. Bell pointed this out in a seminal passage written in 1965:

> ...the high degree of specialization -- both in the fields of knowledge as well as in the structures of organizations -- inevitably creates an almost unbearable strain between "the culture" and the social structure. In fact, it becomes quite difficult to speak even of "the" culture, for not only do specializations create "subcultures" or private worlds -- in the anthropological sense -- but these in turn create private languages and private signs and symbols which often...infiltrate the "public" world of culture.
>
> Today, the culture can hardly, if at all, reflect the society in which people live. The system of social relations is so complex and differentiated, and experiences so specialized, complicated or incomprehensible, that it is difficult to find common symbols of meaning to relate one experience to another.[31]

Bell wrote of the fragmentation of languages within the sciences and between these languages and the realm of common symbols and meaning. One of the problems arising here is the difference between the discourses of theoretical knowledge and of normative, consensual communication.

Francois Lyotard, a philosopher who is currently the French minister of culture, has written an interesting essay concerning these communicative problems.[32] Starting from the proposition that science, culture and politics all have their foundation in discourse, he analyzes how these discourses interact with each other; how the dynamics of these interactions affect the status of knowledge; and ultimately, the relationship between these questions and power.

In addition to fragmenting culture, theoretical (or scientific) knowledge actually undercuts "customary" knowledge. Lyotard explains how this happens in terms of legitimation. While science is marketed as a quest to build a coherent body of knowledge, it is actually a discourse legitimated by "paralogy," or the search for fullacy. As Kuhn pointed out, science expands when a traditional paradigm no longer explains questions raised in normal research. After debate, a new paradigm may emerge. Lyotard argues that this constant probing of legitimacy is the cornerstone of science. Consequently it is involved in a discourse that will continually fragment as new games emerge. On the other hand, customary knowledge is built on discourses designed to establish consensual norms or traditions. These discussions rarely withstand scientific probing of their legitimacy. As Michael Polanyi put it, "we cannot recover a previous state of innocence."[33] Theoretical knowledge, according to Lyotard, has become increasingly dominated by the discourse of the social structure. It will be recalled from my earlier discussion that systems thought is a discourse emphasizing production, which is fundamentally a question of economizing. Science is becoming similarly enframed. Lyotard argues that since science, a discourse predicated on exposing fallacious arguments concerning the natural world, must rely heavily on tools capable of proving assertions it has necessarily become bound to the economic and technical systems of the social structure. The reason for this is that the tools used to

generate "new proof" require spiraling degrees of costly technological sophistication. Technology, he points out, is a game of efficiency in the production of power. Neither the state nor the corporation is particularly interested in seeking truth: "in the discourse of today's financial backers of research, the only credible goal is power. Scientists, technicians and instruments are purchased not to find truth, but to augment power." The need for scientists to acquire technology thus inverts the discourse of theoretical knowledge, making productivity the number one criteria for judging scientific knowledge. Thus knowledge in the information society has been "exteriorized" and turned into a tool for use by the agencies of the social structure and the state. This knowledge, generated as it has been through the discourses of intellectual technology is likely to reflect its source.[34]

Since "knowledge is power" in a very literal sense today, access to it and to the information constituting it are key political issues of the age. The structure of discourse in the realm of science and in the realm of politics and ethics contains a "strict interlinkage." They both involve the question of legitimation -- of judgment. Lyotard believes

> Knowledge and power are simply two sides of the same question: who decides what knowledge is and who decides what needs to be decided. In the computer age, the question of knowledge is now more than ever a question of government.[35]

Political power has been seen by many social theorists, including Max Weber and Talcott Parsons, as the ability of a social system to "get things

done in the interest of collective goals."[36] The first aspect of this definition, the ability to "get things done," expresses an instrumental, or performative aspect of power. Performance, the effectiveness or efficiency of the means used in getting something done, is commonly the major criteria for assessing power. Discussions often focus on what might more accurately be called force, or strength, or violence. This emphasis leads to discussions of the means available for acting.

This connection of performance to power obscures a second aspect which is the determination of the "collective goals." Fundamental to political discussion is the determination of who decides, what is to be decided and how it shall be decided. Hannah Arendt stressed this relationship among people as the fount of political power: the most important aspect of power is its role in creating a common space, a public realm-- or "intellectual commons" to return to Pocock's phrase -- for the deliberation over matters and the communication of decisions. Instead of viewing power as an instrument she argues that it is imminent. It exists in the capacity of men and women to achieve understanding and coordinate their actions. It rests in communicative acts rather than in instrumental relationships:

> Power cannot be stored up and kept in reserve for emergencies ... but exists only in its actualization ... Power is actualized ... where words are not used to veil intentions but to disclose realities and deeds are not used to violate and destroy, but to establish relations and create new realities.

Arendt's point is that power in political discussion should be distinguished from the ability to get things done (force) and further, that it is grounded in legitimacy. This in turn, is based on free and open

discourse among those participating in the public realm. The question is never over the existence of this commons in a society (for except, perhaps, in the last days of a dictatorship where rule is maintained solely through terror, it is always there) but rather concerns its size and the distribution of access to it.[37] The relevance of Arendt's concept of constitutive power for the information society lies in its ability to focus attention on the access citizens have to information and in their ability to judge the meanings supplied by the agencies involved in the generation of discourse. Access and ability to use information and knowledge in public discourse become fundamental components of political power.

If, as Stevens asserts, we have failed to recognize the role information (and by implication knowledge) has played in the unfolding of societies, a discourse concerning the relationships between these variables is long overdue. The stakes here are much higher than many of us, perhaps, realize. Just as information has become a key metaphor for many current explanations of nature, and the tools used in this pursuit have become defining technologies for many thinkers, knowledge has come to the forefront as pivotal -- perhaps the pivotal -- component of both instrumental and constitutive power. Indeed, this can be stated plainly: the axial struggle of the age will be over which discourse of power will inform our view of knowledge. Lyotard describes the information age as one where learning will circulate "along the same lines as money." As knowledge circulates, the control and access channels of communication and centers of codification become pivotal, or as Bell put it, "axial structures."[38]

Three dangers characteristic to the information society cohere around this transformation of information into a recognized commodity and of knowledge into capital. Two are relatively straight-forward and have been much discussed in the library literature. First, private sector charges for information services may price many out of the marketplace, and hence out of the discussion. Second, there is no guarantee that concerns based on the value of a commodity will not be indifferent to data that is not clearly marketable. Some materials may drop out of society's pool of accessible knowledge.[39]

An issue that is less obvious involves managing the wealth of information. A problem characterizing the information society stems from that fact that humans are simply incapable of processing huge volumes of data coming from a multitude of sources quickly enough to make many decisions effectively. The capacity to turn information around expeditiously into knowledge forming the basis for decisions becomes a tremendous competitive advantage. Overload, or "meaning lag," creates strategic positions along the channels of communications for gatekeepers. Individuals must rely on these programmers in their attempts to become informed. As Bruce Gates points out, most of us are captive of "specialized roles, beliefs and ways of thinking as supplied by those who control," or package, information.

Gates argues that belief, rather than knowledge, "is the antecedent to practical instrumental action." In other words, while we use theoretical knowledge as a resource in decision-making, narratively based customary knowledge is what prompts us to act. Since beliefs are built upon discourse, the danger is that

> ...access to information for the purpose of increasing political awareness and for informing public opinion, will be largely controlled by those with a stake in what our personal organizing principles are.

What Gates is driving at is this: Discourse in the information society will be based not only on the data available to individuals, but also on the ways in which information is framed by those in a position to disseminate it. Moreover, the control over information allows the controller a tremendous advantage in setting agendas.

> What these organizing principles are or will become is important because they will determine the ground rules underlying the production of knowledge--or more correctly belief-based "communities."[40]

Access to the "intellectual commons" is thus not the only concern in the maintenance of free discourse. The ability to obtain information must be coupled with an ability to name the gatekeepers and identify their agendas.

As the application of economizing principles to information increasingly become the norm, "public sector information utilities" such as libraries "may find themselves pushed to the periphery."[41] What librarians confront is an outgrowth of the rise of the axiality of information and knowledge, which threatens to consign them to a marginal role in the information society.

The marginalizing of public information sources is vigorously pursued at the policy level in the United States today. For the past few years an assault on the right to access to information has been conducted, primarily under the guise of a campaign for administrative efficiency. There has been a largely successful attempt to establish a "de-facto" national information policy where "information is not a free good but a resource of substantial economic value and should be treated as such." Also, any information to be disseminated to the public must "pass the

supreme test of cost-benefit analysis." As it now stands the factors weighed in such determinations are assigned by people within the present administration who are already party to the information (and who, it goes without saying, have particular interests) which is being judged. Through executive order, the dismantling of access to information concerning public matters is well advanced. The recent RFP for contracting out the National Technical Information Service is but one example of this trend.[42]

I have attempted to indicate the roles access to information and knowledge, as well as the ability to judge the messages used to convey them, play in maintaining free discourse. Further, I have discussed the role of this discourse in maintaining democratic governance. Presently, the trend in the public realm is to emphasize a concept of "self-sufficiency" grounded in civil liberty, but mostly in economic rationality, as against a concept of "mutual dependence" in the discourse concerning public welfare. Tension between these poles has created a duality that has guided discourse in the American political tradition since the nation's beginnings.[43]

The current temper of this discourse implies that knowledge is to be governed primarily by a discourse of economizing rather than a discourse of political participation. The organizing principles of this discourse, or at least the information, knowledge and filtering systems required to develop them, are slipping from the grasp of an informed citizenry. Thomas Jefferson identified the stakes involved here in 1816 with the observation that "if a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."[44] How does librarianship fit into the information society? How will the "substance

and organization" of the library adapt to meet the challenges posed by its external environment? How will libraries respond to "the social necessity which (our) profession serves?" In order to discuss these questions we need to turn our focus inward, and examine the discourses which inform our responses to the world outside our doors.

The Internal Dimension

At the outset, I identified the communicative nature of leadership and emphasized MacGregor's belief that leadership is fundamentally a relationship. At its best this relationship involves the constitutive power that Arendt spoke of. Good leaders harness this power, turning it into effective planning and action. In a recent book on leadership, John P. Kotter reviewed studies of effective managers at various echelons in public and private organizations. He concludes,

> The effective leadership of a project team located ten layers below the CEO in a larger corporation and the overall effective leadership of the overall corporation by the CEO both seem to share some fundamentals in common: a good vision and strategy backed up by sufficient teamwork and motivation."[45]

He distills this into two factors found in effective leadership of complex organizations: "creating an agenda for change" and building a strong implementation network."

The notions of discourse summarized earlier are pertinent to the cultivation of both of these factors. Ultimately it is through the constitutive power of communicative acts that organizations and institutions establish both their agendas and build their networks for accomplishing what these call for.

In discussing the inner realm of librarianship, we must first consider the levels at which our discourses take place and how they interact. Peering inward an observer might find discussions operating along three major pathways. At the level nearest the interface with the outside world, one would encounter a meta-discourse concerning the role of libraries in society. Discussions would highlight fundamental missions and services which librarians undertake. These would include discussion of archival responsibilities, the provision of access to information, and the library's educational missions. The discussion of these roles would follow a multiplicity of patterns as participants from various backgrounds engaged each other. Within the discussion generated from all of these locales, there is embedded a key question--what is the nature of libraries? Of "the Library?" can we legitimately speak of a unified concept, employing some kind of notion of a library network of Alexandrian scope? Are we dealing with an institution or merely with units inside of other social agencies? Treatment of these questions is clouded because the meta-discourse of the profession rests on a shakey substrata of shifting organizational and disciplinary discussions.

There are, as we all know (but perhaps need to remind our hypothetical observer) various types of libraries. There are academic, public and school libraries, special libraries, research libraries, college libraries, etc. (not to mention Library Schools, Schools of Library Science, Schools of Library and Information Science, etc.). At each of these levels, there are discussions informed by the speaker's particular vantage point.

Our observer's picture is muddied even further by competing claims arising from within different units of individual organizations. Even within a single library, there are the competing languages of the cataloger, the reference librarian, the provider of bibliographic instruction, the administrator, etc. To use Bell's terminology, at least two disjunctions can be adduced to account for these gulfs. One is a difference between the languages of public and technical services; the other is a disjunction between the discourses of administration and operative staff. In a report commissioned by the Academic and Research Libraries Personnel Study Group of ACRL, Allen B. Veaner, lamenting the "atomization endemic to the profession", observed that:

> ...we debate the profession's inability to speak with one voice, yet the responsible forces may be the same ones that divide the entire academic establishment into so many parts. Institutional structures such as heirarchy and departmentation in the larger research libraries, assist the process to the point where isolationism can develop to ridiculous degrees.[46]

He wonders whether this fragmentation "merely reflects the general academic fragmentation that has characterized research since the 19th century." One would certainly hope not--librarianship by paralogy, to appropriate form Lyotard, clearly will not do.

Yet, we seem to have a difficult time of it when we try to communicate with one another about matters of central importance to the profession. It is not tremendously reassuring to read, for example, that in 1987

> Getting librarians and administrators to view their respective roles realistically and work together constructively in a collegial, congenial, trusting partnership would seem to be the top priority.[47]

As if this were a major revelation. Or, that knowing

> The social, economic and political context in which the library operates" is "not as high a priority as knowledge of one's discipline." For "These contexts are not as important as leadership in being effective."[48]

Or,

> "The bewildered groping which characterizes so much of our activity[49] is largely the result of lack of definite conception of our purposes.

and realize that these last words, written in 1934, resonate so well today. Why should we be surprised when our competitors in the information society, the purveyors of "instant information" in Hollywood on Madison Avenue mock us in soda commercials and comic-book level movies about ghosts?

Well, perhaps I have stuffed my strawperson a bit too full. Perhaps I have even misunderstood the context of these particular speech acts. But it remains that, on the whole, we have not done a really good job legimating our profession or the institution we serve. One measure of this is the disrespect the external world shows the M.L.S. degree in assessing our capabilities. An even crueler twist is a state of affairs where a statement by a library director that "so many members of our profession do not have a strong intellectual commitment to librarianship" is not unwarranted.[50]

Professional leadership is about creating the discourse by which we will constitute an "agenda for change," and build the networks we require to implement it. Library leaders must recognize this necessity. Fortunately many do. In the happily named book, Library Leadership: Visualizing the Future[51] some of our professional leaders grapple with what leadership means within their particular disciplinary matrices. It is instructive to hear what some of them have to say.

Carolyn Dusenbury defines leadership as the exercise of influence. "The exercise of influence is that of making things happen, of mobilizing and organizing toward the accomplishment of goals." For her, leadership in reference is the development of a theory of reference service. Her premise is "that a theoretical foundation that is widely practiced and understood can help them solve common problems and also help them to anticipate the issues they will face in the next 20 years." This discourse will catalyze bibliographic instruction, computer-assisted reference service, the evaluation of reference services and rights to information access.[52]

Michael Gorman develops the distinction between leadership and administration. This involves vision: "The essential difference between management/administration on one hand and leadership on the other is that the former is concerned with what is and the latter is concerned with what will be." Leaders in technical services must be willing to "adapt the organization of technical services," to "rationalize," to accept the implications of automation, and to "engage in useful and realistic cooperation."[53]

For Edward E. Shaw, leadership requires the "courage to fail." In order to minimize the failure of our leaders, he focuses on the need to understand the relationship between university and the library, the impact of technology on the library, and the relationships between strategic planning, governance, and leadership.[54]

These essays provide us with many of the elements we need to develop a forceful discourse of librarianship. They also emphasize the librarian's role as a manager. This emphasis is especially crucial, if, as many observers have argued, the professional librarian is "shifting from

production to management." If this be true, our professional discourse must support the necessary changes in outlook. The challenge for leaders will be to develop a discourse that will nurture "... talented, creative administrators (leaders) who recognize that obligations to long-term employees include creating a challenging and satisfying work environment where daily problems are confronted directly."[55] In other words, within our departments, the language of leadership involves the promotion of an institutional culture which will sustain "implementation networks." The ability to do so involves the ability to transmit a cogent vision of what it is all about. Motivation.

A problem facing many libraries, however, it the instability of cultural traditions. After discussing the importance of philosophy in eloquent terms, David W. Lewis, observes that

> Organizational philosophies generally begin at the top, and as we have seen, academic library directors may not stay in one place long enough to leave their mark. In addition, advancement in academic librarianship often requires movement between institutions. Without stability, the cultural traditions of the organization are lost.[56]

Ironically, knowledge conserving organizations have difficulty maintaining their institutional memory.

Clearly, J. Perriam Danton's 1934 "Plea for a Philosophy of Librarianship" is a relevant topic of conversation for us today. The language of leadership requires the articulation of vision. This discourse must proceed from an accounting of "all the relevant organizational and environmental forces."[57] It must involve a discussion of our "facticity", or role in the information society. Most of the foregoing has concerned academic libraries, but I submit it applies across the board in the library world.

Conclusion

The primary role of the library is the preservation of knowledge. In fulfilling this mission, the library exercises an institutional role in society. Social institutions such as the family, the polity, the social structure, and the culture are the locations of the discourses through which we are able to build communities. The organizations which transform our institutions into social reality are generally seen as secondary institutions or social agencies. Thus major concepts such as the family, religion or law define the outlines of society while agencies such as courts and churches are shaped by the outlines. (The primary actors in the discourse of the institutions may well be the workers in the agencies.) As we have seen, these institutions are pulling away from each other, and many of the agencies supporting them have a difficult time legitimating themselves. We are not the only ones with problems characterized by the information age.

The library, ultimately, is responsible for the preservation of knowledge. No other body has accepted this mission. It therefore takes on the cast of an institution, even though most libraries are embedded in other organizations. Gordon Neavill pointed this out in an article in Library Resources and Technical Services in 1984:

> The library is the primary social institution by means of which a society remains in contact with and in possession of its accumulated stock of recorded knowledge. The library has served its institutional role in all literate societies, whatever their particular social environments have been. In this role the library is as basic to the fabric of society as are institutions like the family and state. Remaining in contact with its stock of knowledge is a matter of fundamental importance to any society. Indeed, a society can be well defined in terms of its stock of knowledge and how that knowledge is distributed among its members.[58]

The librarian is also an agent charged with empowering people by providing access to knowledge. As against those in the "instant information" business, the librarian is, or ought to be, a gatekeeper who uses the position to help individuals "decide what is important" for themselves. Asheim points out the uniqueness of the Librarian in this regard:

> More than any other gatekeeper in the field of formal communication, the librarian is devoted to the tradition of individual service and individual response...the individual exchange remains the keystone of the library's service.[59]

Joan Bechtel is surely on the right track when she asks in the title of an article in CRL, "Conversation, A New Paradigm for Librarianship?" She answers, "libraries bear the critical burden of preserving facilitating, and participating in" the discourse of the information society.[60] Leadership in the profession means helping to shape the conversation.

The conversation must involve the establishment of an agenda which deals with the realities of the information age and helps us to develop means for responding to challenges to individual access and participation in the intellectual commons of our society. There are a lot of permutations and levels for our talks. Debates concerning "Fee v. Free," or the "paperless society," for example, are useful to us if we use them to build up the quality of our professional discourse. Similarly discussions between different branches of the profession should always take into account our ultimate purposes as a way of bridging gaps. What we do at the task-environment level is not the end, but the means. One thing we should always be mindful of: What Jefferson pointed out in the Agricultural Age is no less true in the Information Age' a society cannot be ignorant and free.

1/ Douglas MacGregor, Leadership and Motivation (Cambridge: MIT, 1966), pp. 73-74.

2/ Herbert A. Simon, The Science of the Artificial, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: MIT, 1981), pp. 8-10. Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett point this emphasis on the organization-environment interface:

> "Systems theory provides a conceptual overview of organizational functioning. The whole organization and its subsystems are interrelated. Further, they are related to their environment. Managers need to know how to a specific organization and its subsystems are related in a given environment and thus how to deal with a particular problem" Management 4th ed. (N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1981), P. 625.

3/ Michael K. Buckland, Library Services in Theory and Context (New York: Pergamon, 1983), pp. 29-33.

4/ Ida R. Hoos notes that the "lynch-pin" of systems approaches is the "cost-benefit ratio." This "simple principle of trade off was to be parlayed into position as the keystone of public management." She decries the enshrinement of the systems approach as the enframing of public policy discourse in a context based on a single principle as our paramount intellectual technology. Some of the limitations of this approach include its "intolerance and antagonism" to unquantifiable variables, its bias against social and human factors, over-reliance on markets, and technical solutions. Nevertheless, she argues,

> "So firmly have the techniques established their synonymity with rationality that to criticize them is to condone the antonym, irrationality. Thus, not only have other approaches been delegitimized, but a cordon sanitaire, setting of the area of concern as technical, has isolated debate within arbitrary confines of a certain limited model. Quarantined in this way, the problem becomes the bailiwick of 'technical experts.'" Systems Analysis in Public Policy: A Critique, revised ed. (Berkeley: California, 1972), p. xvi, 248-249.
>
> As we will note below, this approach has implications in the realm of knowledge.

5/ G. Travis White has pointed out, "The pressure from funding agencies and taxpayers to obtain the most cost-effective services possible has forced librarians to turn to quantifiable measures of performance." He gives three reasons for "the rising importance of quantifiable measures": (1) increasing accountability, (2) enhance capability to meet goals and objectives, and (3) ability to control costs. "Quantitative Measures of Library Effectiveness," Journal of Academic Librarianship 3 (July 1977): 128.

Indeed a strong case can be made that one of the paramount weaknesses of our profession is the inability to apply the "scientific method to the procurement of new library science knowledge." As Charles B. Busha and Stephen B. Harter have argued,

> "the status of librarianship as a viable profession and the position of library science as a meaningful and worthwhile field of study hinge upon the question of whether practicing professionals and scholars in the field can develop a structure of theoretical and practical knowledge; generate hypotheses relevant to pertinent theories; and plan, conduct and evaluate both basic and applied research in a scientific manner." Research Methods in Librarianship: Techniques and Interpretation (N.Y.: Academic Press, 1980), p. 29.

6/ Our view point will, to borrow from Martin Heidegger's vocabulary, become "enframed." See "The Question Concerning Technology" in The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1977) pp. 3-55.

7/ Lester Asheim, "Librarians as Professionals," Library Trends 27 (Winter 1979): 225-257; Jose Ortega y Gassett, The Mission of the Librarian James Lewis and Ray Carpenter, tran. (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1961), p. 7.

8/ The emphasis on rational design in the logic of the systems appraoch is succinctly explained by Simon:

> "The outer environment determines the conditions for goal attainment. If the inner system is properly designed it will be adapted to the outer environment, sot that its behavior will be determined in large part by the latter, exactly as in the case of 'economic man.'"

Sciences of the Artificial, p. 15.

9/ Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1975. Interestingly, an archaic meaning of discourse involves the process of reasoning and understanding. Indeed, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, the oldest usage of the term can be found in Chaucer where it was used in this sense.

10/ The foundation of discourse lies in the rules governing an event, the "speech act." A speech act is essentially a communications process involving a speaker, hearer an utterance. This can be reformulated into:

Sender ----> Message ----> Receiver

A detailed explanation of speech acts can be found in John Searle, "What is a Speech Act?" in Language and Social Context, ed. Pier Paolo Gigioli (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), pp. 136-154.

11/ Francois Lyotard, The Post-Modern Condition: A Report on Knowledge (Minneapolis: Minnesota, 1984), p. 40.

12/ Michel Foucault, The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language (N.Y.: Pantheon, 1972), p. 216. Toews emphasizes the Foucaultian connection of discourse to power:

> "...discourse are perceived a intimately tied to institutions and social practices, as forming structures of domination or systems of power. Discourses might be described as impersonal, anonymous 'objective systems of rules that, in a practical and active sense, construct the world of objects and subjects, the world of experience ." (p. 810) "Intellectual History After the Linguistic Turn: The Autonomy of Meaning and the Irreducibility of Experience," American Historical Review 92 (October 1987): 879-907.

13/ Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 2nd ed., enlarged (Chicago: Chicago, 1970).

Paradigms according to Kuhn, operate on three levels. The broadest involve basic metaphysical and epistemological problems. These metaparadigms ground fundamental assumptions of a science and in turn affect all science and society at large. Second level paradigms are called "disciplinary matrices." These are "shared commitments of any disciplinary community." These discourses form a network of communication and shared meaning, binding together a subculture of specialists. At the lowest level, Kuhn's paradigms are conceptual tools used in unlocking specific puzzles. Douglas Lee Eckberg and Lester Hill, Jr., "The Paradigm Concept and Sociology: A Critical Review," American Sociological Review 44 (December 1979): 929.

14/ Toews, "Intellectual History, p. 891. Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis provide a good example of this conception of discourse in the political realm in their assessment of the languages of liberalism and Marxism. The distinctiveness of each lies more in "how" they say than "what" they say about the world:

> "Whatever internal coherence these traditions possess derives more from their status as systems of communications than from their substantive propositions about how the world works or ought to work. Their particular characteristics lie not in their specific theoretical assertions, but in a way each, considered as a system of communication, establishes rules as to how social reality will be represented in terms of its vocabulary. In short, both traditions are discourses whose most fundamental orientation concerning structure and action in social life are revealed by customary usage of key terms." Democracy and Capitalism: Property, Community and the Contradictions of Modern Social Thought (N.Y.: Basic, 1987), p. 15.

15/ Thomas McCarthy, "Introduction," in Jurgen Habermas, Legitimation Crisis trans. Thomas McCarthy (Boston: Beacon, 1975), p. xvii. Habermas has attempted to develop a comprehensive social theory based on analysis of discourse. For a detailed description of his method see "What is Universal Pragmatics? in Communication and the Evolution of Society, trans. Thomas McCarthy (Boston: Beacon, 1979), pp. 1-68, See Legitimation Crisis.

16/ Tjerk Huppes, The Western Edge: Work and Management in the Information Age (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1987), pp. 9-17; Marc Uri Porat, The Information Economy (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Telecommunications, 1977)

Porat divided the economy into six sectors. Two of these were information based, made up of producers of information technology, marketers of information services, and those engaged in production and manipulation of information and knowledge. These groups generated twenty-two percent (22%) of GNP. A secondary group, information workers, based in the other sectors, accounted for another twenty-two percent (22%) of GNP.

17/ Henry M. Kibirige, The Information Dilemma: A Critical Analysis of Information Pricing and the Fees Controversy (Westport: Greenwood, 1983), p. 6.

18/ Norman D. Stevens, "The History of Information," in Advances in Librarianship, vol. 14, ed. Wesley Simonton (Orlando: Academic Press, 1986), p. 1.

19/ Carl L. Becker, The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers (New Haven: Yale, 1932).

20/ Herbert A Simon, "What Computer Mean for Man and Society," Science 195 (18 March 1977): 1186.

21/ J. David Bolter, Turing's Man: Western Culture in the Computer Age (Chapel Hill: North Carolina, 1984), p. 13.

22/ Daniel Bell, The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting (N.Y.: Basic, 1973), p. 30.

23/ See, for example, Jeremy Campbell, Gramatical Man: Information, Entropy, Language and Life (N.Y.: Simon and Schuster, 1982).

24/ Blaise Cronin, "The Information Society," ASLIB Proceedings 34 (April 1985): 127. He goes on to say

> "It is, however, an unusual commodity: one which does not deplete on consumption, which can have multiple life cycles, which can be easily replicated or mass produced, which violates some of the basic rules of ownership, which can have positive externalities and which, perhaps most importantly, has some of the features of a social good."

25/ Daniel Bell, "The Social Framework of the Information Society," in The Computer Age: A Twenty Year View, Michael Dertouzos and Joel Moses, eds. (Cambridge: MIT, 1979), p. 168.

26/ Bell, Post-Industrial Society, p. 26.

27/ Don R. Swanson, "Libraries and the Growth of Knowledge," in The Role of Libraries in the Growth of Knowledge, Don R. Swanson, ed. (Chicago,, Chicago, 1980), pp. 114-115. Swanson presents a view of knowledge based on the work of Karl Popper: The effort is one of "a building-block approach to erecting the edifice of knowledge." (p. 17)

28/ Habermas, "What is Universal Pragmatics?" pp. 26-29; McCarthy, "Introduction," Legitimation Crisis, pp. xiii-xiv.

29/ Orrin E. Klapp describes this problem aptly:

> "Scholars generally agree that there has been a crisis of meaning in modern times. Alienation, existential despair, absurdity,, legitimation crisis, identity problem, anomaly, sensate culture, counter culture, future shock, end of ideology, false consciousness and social noise are some of the names by which this crisis has been identified. In a crisis of meaning, people find much that doesn't make sense, little that is basic or reliable to hang onto. Traditions are discarded; institutions -- even the most hallowed -- are weakly legitimated and justify themselves by rhetoric regarded by many as boring or hypocritical."
>
> "Meaning Lag in the Information Society," Journal of Communication 32 (Spring 1982): 56.

30/ Bell, Post-Industrial Society, p. 114.

31/ Bell, "The Disjunction of Culture and Social Structure: Some Notes on the Meaning of Social Reality," in Science and Culture: A Study of Disjunctive and Cohesive Forces, Gerald Holton, ed. (Boston: Beacon, 1965), p. 244.

32/ Lyotard, Post-Modern Condition.

33/ Ibid., see chapters 6 and 7; Michael Polanyi, "The Two Cultures," in Knowing and Being: Essays by Michael Polanyi, Majorie Grene, ed. (Chicago: Chicago, 1969), p. 46.

34/ Lyotard, Post-Modern Condition, p. 4.

35/ Ibid., p. 9. The question of making judgment involves two issues: First, the ability to "become informed" is based not only on access to information, but on the ability to process it sufficiently to use it as a basis for making decisions. Second, is the question

concerning the communication of beliefs and decisions which must be legitimated among a population. If consensus breaks down, both the knowledge and the political discourse of a society degenerates. No community of free individuals will perform very well if its members cannot participate in communicative actions on a reasonable equal footing.

36/ Habermas, "Hannah Arendt on the Concept of Power," in Philosophical-Political Profile, Thomas McCarthy, trans. (Cambridge: MIT, 1983), p. 172.

37/ Hannah Arendt, The Human Condition (Chicago: Chicago, 1958), p. 200.

38/ Lyotard, Post-Modern Condition, p. 6.

39/ Gordon B. Neavill, "Electronic Publishing, Libraries and the Survival of Information," Library Resources and Technical Services 28 (January-March 1984): 81-87; See also Irving Louis Horowitz, "The Political Economy of Database Technology," Book Research Quarterly 1 (Spring 1985): 67-80.

40/ Bruce Gates, "Knowledge, Networks and Neighborhoods: Will Microcomputers Make us Better Citizens:" Public Administration Review 44 (March 1984): p. 167. For a discussion of meaning lag, see Klapp, "Meaning Lag in the Information Society."

41/ Cronin, "The Information Society," pp. 128-129.

42/ Walter Karp, "Library Under Siege: The Reagan Administration's Taste for Autocracy." Harpers 271 (November 1985): 53-67; Harold B. Shill, "Report to ACRL Science and Technology Section on NTIS Privatization," 18 February 1988, ACRL, Chicago.

43/ High Heclo, "General Welfare and Two American Political Traditions," Political Science Quarterly 101 (2)(1986): 179-196.

44/ Thomas Jefferson, "Letter to Colonel Yancey," 1816 quoted in Thomas Jefferson on Democracy, Saul K. Padover, ed. (N.Y.: Mentor, 1939), p. 89.

45/ John P. Kotter, The Leadership Factor, (N.Y.: Macmillan, 1988), pp. 19-21. Kotter fleshes this out by identifying four threads common to successful leaders: (1) strong vision which takes into account the legitimate interests of all the people involved," (2) "a strategy that recognizes all the broadly relevant environmental forces and organizational factors," (3) sufficient means and "a coalition powerful enough to implement that strategy", (4) a "highly motivated...group committed to making that vision a reality."

46/ Allen B. Veaner,, "1985 to 1995; The Next Decade in Academic Librarianship, Part I," CRL 63 (June 1985): 215.

47/ Brian Alley, "What Professional Librarians Expect from Administrators: An Administrator's Response," CRL 48 (September 1987): 420.

48/ Irene B. Hoadley, "Reactions to 'Defining the Academic Librarian" CRL 46 (November 1985): 469. She was responding to a paper by Edward G. Holley published in the same issue, "Defining the Academic Librarian." pp. 462-468. Holley argued for the need for academic librarians to have four kinds of knowledge beyond "professional library skills:" knowledge in the history and development of the institution of the university, understanding of scholarship and learning, a knowledge of the discourse of disciplines, and an ability to evaluate research. Hoadley argues that teaching these contexts is impossible in a one year curriculum. That this may be true speaks for itself.

49/ J. Periam Danton, "Plea for a Philosophy of Librarianship," in American Library Philosophy: An Anthology, Barbara McCrimmon, ed. (Hamden: Shoe-String Press, 1975), p. 79. This was originally published in Library Quarterly, 4 (October, 1934): 527-551.

50/ Veaner, "1985-1995: The Next Decade in Academic Librarianship, Part II," CRL 64 (July 1985): pp. 302-303, Holley, "Defining the Academic Librarian," pp. 467-468.

51/ Donald E. Riggs, Ed. Library Leadership: Visualizing the Future (Phoenix: Oryx, 1982).

52/ Carolyn Dusenbury, "Reference Service: Software in the Hardware Age," in Visualizing the Future, pp. 94-109.

53/ Michael Gorman, "A Good Heart and an Organized Mind: Leadership in Technical Services," in Visualizing the Future, pp. 73-83.

54/ Edward E. Shaw, "The Courage to Fail," in Visualizing the Future, pp. 53-65.

55/ Veaner, "The Next Decade, Part II," p. 295; Johannah Sherrer, "Reaction to Veaner," CRL 64 (July 1985): 312.

56/ David W. Lewis, "An Organizational Paradigm for Effective Academic Libraries," CRL 47 (July 1985): 351.

57/ Kotter, Leadership Factor, p. 20.

58/ Neavill, "Survival of Information," p. 80; See also, Peter Briscoe, et al. "Ashurbanipal's Enduring Archetype; Thoughts on the Library's Role in the Future, CRL 47 (March 1986); 121-126.

59/ Lester Asheim, "Ortega Revisted", Library Quarterly 52 (July 1982): 221.

60/ Joan M. Bechtel, "Conversation, A New Paradigm for Librarianship?" CRL 47 (May 1986): 222.